

PĀŚUPATA DOCTRINE AS TRANSMITTED BY VEDĀNTINS

I

As is well-known, the basic textual material for understanding the doctrine and ritual practices of Pāśupata Śaivism are the *Pāśupata-sūtra* (PS), ascribed to its founder Lakulīśa, and its commentary, the *Pañcārtha-bhāṣya* (PABh) composed by Kauṇḍinya. The text was edited by R.A. Sastri and published from Trivandrum in 1940¹. However, this edition had to be based upon a single manuscript and consequently it suffers from lacunae of various sorts and leaves unintelligible readings here and there².

Prior to this, C. D. Dalal published another Pāśupata treatise entitled *Gaṇakārikā* (GK) in 1920 from Baroda. This is composed in eight *śloka*s, listing some forty technical terms peculiar to Pāśupata Śaivism, and furnished with a lucid commentary called *Ratna-ṭīkā* (RT)³. Ordinarily, the *Kārikā* is ascribed to Haradatta and the *Ṭīkā* to Bhāsarvajña, but the possibility of attribution to the particular authors still remains obscure.

1. *Pāśupata-sūtra with Pañcārtha-bhāṣya of Kauṇḍinya*, edited by R.A. SASTRI (TSS 143), Trivandrum 1940.

2. Variant readings for the PS, drawn from a manuscript of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, were published by C. CHAKRAVARTI in IHQ 19, pp. 270-271, Calcutta 1943.

3. *Gaṇa-kārikā*, edited by the late Mr. C.D. DALAL (GOS 15), Baroda 1920.

Thus, we have two textual groups, PS and PABh on the one hand and GK and RT on the other. Within each group, that is, between PS and PABh and between GK and RT, there exists naturally a relationship of the basic scriptures (*sūtra* and *kārikā*) and their commentaries (*bhāṣya* and *ṭīkā*).

Now a question arises, what is the inter-relationship within these textual groups, PS-PABh on the one hand and GK-RT on the other?

First, let us examine the relationship between RT and the textual group PS and PABh. A philological analysis of quotations found in RT clearly indicates that the author of RT knew not only of the existence of PS, but also of PABh. He calls PS as a whole *śāstra* or *tantra*, and occasionally quotes PS passages under the names of *upadeśa* or *pravacana*. As regards PABh, he calls the author Kauṇḍinya by the honorific title of *bhāṣyakṛt* (the author of the commentary) and quotes his words as the authoritative *jñāpakas*. This textual evidence shows that the author of RT was aware of the existence of PS and PABh when he composed his treatise⁴.

Next, comes the question, in what relation does GK stand to PS and PABh? As is mentioned above, GK enumerates systematically some forty technical terms peculiar to Pāśupata Śaivism in the form of eight memorial verses (*kārikā*). Curiously enough, some twenty out of these forty technical terms occur in PABh ad PS 5.30 in a less systematic way. A comparison of the systematic list of these terms given in GK with the sporadic occurrence of the terms in PABh indicates the apparent historical priority of PABh to GK⁵.

These comparative studies lead us to conclude a historical precedence of the textual group of PS-PABh to that of GK-RT⁶.

4. M. HARA, "Quotations found in the *Ratnaṭīkā* of Bhāsarvajña", *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, volume in honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday, Canberra 1982, pp. 187-209.

5. M. HARA, "Pāśupata Studies II", WZKS 38 (1994), pp. 323-335.

6. As early as in 1938, A. Ziesenis detected with penetrating insight the existence of these two textual groups in Mādhava's composition of *Nakulīśa-pāśupata-darśanam*. But, due to the lack of material at that time, he was mistaken in making GK and RT represent the older doctrine and PABh the younger.

II

Prior to the publication of these texts, that is, PS with PABh and GK with RT, in the twentieth century, the only available source for the study of Pāśupata Śaivism was Mādhava's account given in the sixth chapter of his *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha* (SDS), entitled *Nakuliśa-pāśupata-darśanam*. Mādhava's chapter is, however, replete with quotations from scriptural passages, and an analysis of the quotations shows that Mādhava composed this chapter with his constant reference to the basic texts, which had long been thought to be lost⁷.

Under such circumstances, scholars had to rely solely upon Mādhava's account for the description of Pāśupata Śaivism, and thus, scholars such as H.Th. Colebrooke⁸, E.B. Cowell⁹, P. Deussen¹⁰, and S. Lévi¹¹ translated Mādhava's chapter into western languages and discussed relevant problems.

With the publication of PS-PABh, the situation completely changed. Soon after publication, such Indian scholars as K. K. Handiqui¹², and V. Raghavan¹³ made a special mention of it and emphasised its importance, but it was S. Dasgupta who first introduced Pāśupata theology and philosophy on the basis of the contents of PABh in his

Cf. A. ZIESENISS, "Mādhavas Methoden der Quellenbenutzung erläutert an Hand zweier Kapitel der Sarvadarśana-saṃgraha", (Anhand zu ZDMG Bd.92, *32*- *33*).

7. M. HARA, "Nakuliśapāśupatadarśanam", IJ 2 1958, pp. 8-32.

8. Colebrooke 1828: H.TH. COLEBROOKE, "On the Philosophy of the Hindus", *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1, pp. 569-574 (1828).

9. E.B. COWELL and A.E. GOUGH, *The Sarvadarśanasamgraha, or Review of the different systems of Hindu Philosophy by Mādhava Āchārya* (Trubners Oriental Series) pp. 103-111 (London 1882).

10. P. DEUSSEN, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religionen* I.3, pp. 302-311 (Leipzig 1908).

11. S. LÉVI, "Deux chapitres de Sarvadarśanasamgraha", *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes, Sciences religieuses* I, pp. 281ff. (Paris 1889)(= *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, P. Hartmann éditeur, pp. 169-177, Paris 1937).

12. K.K. HANDIQUI, *Yāśastilaka and Indian Culture, or Somadeva's Yāśastilaka and Aspects of Jainism and Indian Thought and Culture in the Tenth Century* (Sholapur 1942), pp. 199-203, 234-240 and 337-350.

13. V. RAGHAVAN, "Tiruvorriyur Inscriptions at Chaturānana Paṇḍita III", *El* 27, 1951, p. 296, note 4.

monumental *History of Indian Philosophy*¹⁴. Three years later, in 1958 a German scholar, F.A. Schultz completed his Dissertation, entitled *Die philosophisch-theologischen Lehren des Pāśupata-systems nach dem PABh und der RT.*¹⁵ and in 1970 a complete English translation was made by an Indian scholar, H. Chakraborti¹⁶. J. Gonda gave a brief survey both in German¹⁷ and English¹⁸ of Pāśupata Śaivism, and G. Oberhammer has been contributing to the elucidation of various aspects of Pāśupata Śaivism in a series of important publications¹⁹. From the iconographical point of view, art-historians have been investigating the so-called Lakulīṣa images which have been discovered in various parts of India²⁰.

However, it is wrong to say that, prior to the publication of these four basic texts in the twentieth century, no information had been preserved outside Mādhava's account. Since *Brahma-sūtra* (BS) 2.2.37 was written with the intention of refuting Pāśupata theology, those who wrote commentaries upon that particular *sūtra* are presumed to say something about the Pāśupata theology and philosophy. Viewed in this light, we may expect that one can gather some information concerning Pāśupata Śaivism from the BS commentaries and sub-commentaries.

It is, then, an interesting task for a Pāśupata student to collect these sporadic materials as far as possible, and to compare their

14. S. DASGUPTA, *History of Indian Philosophy* vol.5, pp. 130-149 (Cambridge 1955).

15. Cf. HARA, IJ 3, pp. 165-170 (Review).

16. Cf. HARA, IJ 16, pp. 57-80 (Review).

17. J. GONDA, *Die Religionen Indiens* II (Stuttgart 1964) pp. 213-219.

18. J. GONDA, *Mediaeval Religious Literature in Sanskrit* (Wiesbaden 1977), pp. 216-231.

19. G. OBERHAMMER, *Wahrheit und Transzendenz* (Wien 1984).

Id., "The Use of Mantra in Yogic Meditation. The Testimony of the Pāśupata", in H.P. ALPER (ed.) *Understanding Mantras* (New York 1989) pp. 204-223.

Id., "Der Tod in der Spiritualität des Pāśupata", in G. OBERHAMMER (ed.), *Im Tod gewinnt der Mensch sein Selbst* (Wien 1995) pp. 141-180.

Id., *La délivrance, de cette vie (jīvanmukti)* (Paris 1994) pp. 74-109.

20. Cf., for example, J.N. BANERJEA, *The Development of Hindu Iconography* (Calcutta 1956) pp.450-2, 465-6, 480-1.

M.W. MEISTER, *Discourses on Śiva* (Philadelphia 1984) pp. 92-118, and p.345 (Index for Lakulīṣa images).

descriptions with that given in the basic texts available now in the twentieth century. In the pages which follow, we shall first quote relevant passages from the BS commentaries, starting from the great Śaṅkara, and then discuss the textual problems.

III

(3-1) In Śaṅkara's description of Pāśupata Śaivism, we read as follows,

*sā ceyam veda-bāhyeśvara-kalpanāneka-prakārā/ māheśvarās tu manyante,
kārya-kāraṇa-yoga-vidhi-duḥkhāntāḥ pañca padārthāḥ paśupatineśva-
reṇa paśu-pāśa-vimokṣaṇāyopadiṣṭāḥ paśupatir īśvaro nimitta-kāraṇam
iti varṇayanti*²¹.

"This system remains outside the vedic tradition (*veda-bāhya*), and postulates (the existence of) the god (*īśvara*). It consists of various sectarian branches (*prakāra*). Out of these, however, the Māheśvaras consider as follows. The effect, cause, union, prescribed regimens and cessation of sufferings – these five are the basic categories (*padārtha*), which are proclaimed by the lord of cattle who is the god himself for the sake of delivering cattle from their fetters. They speak of the lord of cattle, that is the god, as the efficient cause (*nimitta-kāraṇa*)".

Here in Śaṅkara's description, we note that he condemns our system as heretical by using the name *veda-bāhya*, the term which often appears in the Epic and Purāṇic literature²². It is remarkable that

21. Text used here is *Brahmasūtra-Śaṅkarabhāṣyam*, with the Commentaries: *Bhāṣyaratnāprabhā* of Govindānanda, *Bhāmātī* of Vācaspatimiśra and *Nyāya-nirṇaya* of Ānandagiri, edited by J.L. Shastri (Delhi 1980) pp. 488.

22. I quote below some passages from the *Kūrma-purāṇa* (KP), MBh., and Śrībhāṣya.

They are called *veda-nindā-rata* (fond of slighting the Veda),
*pāśaṇḍīno vikarmasthān vāmācārāṇis tathaiva ca
pañcarātrān pāśupatān vāṇ-mātreṇāpi nārcayet* (15)

he is well aware of the five categories (*pañcārtha*), which are proclaimed in a similar way in the first *sūtra* of PS.

Note-worthy is also the order of the enumeration of these five categories, *kārya-kāraṇa-yoga-vidhi-duḥkhānta*, because this order is the same as that which we have in the Pāsupata basic treatises. The technical terms such as *paśu*, *pati* and *pāśa* are also peculiar to Saivite literature and the compound *paśu-pāśa-vimokṣa* appears in the *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad*.

(3-2) In this connection it would be convenient to examine briefly how the Pāsupatas are further explained by the sub-commentators

veda-nindā-ratān *martyān* deva-nindā-ratāṃs *tathā*
dvija-nindā-ratāṃs *caiva manasāpi na cintayet* (KP 2.16.16)

They are *veda-viruddha* (opposed to the Vedic tradition) and *veda-bāhya* (remaining outside the Vedic tradition),

anyāni caiva śāstrāṇi loke 'smīn mohanāni tu
veda-vāda-viruddhāni mayāiva kathitāni tu (145)
vāmaṇ paśupataṇ somaṇ lākulaṇ caiva bhairavam
asevyaṃ etat kathitaṃ veda-bāhyaṇ tathetarāṃ (KP 2.37.146)

Rāmānuja in his *Śrībhāṣya* also condemns the *paśupati-mata* as *veda-virodha* (p. 160, line 7), *veda-viruddha* (p. 160, line 10) or *veda-bāhya* (p. 163, line 12). Cf. also p. 161, line 21 (*veda-virodha*), p. 162, line 2, p. 165, line 10 (*veda-viruddha*).

The following epic passages style the Pāsupatas as partly orthodox (vedic) and partly heterodox (anti-vedic).

vedāt ṣaḍ-aṅgād uddhṛtya *sāṃkhyā-yogāc ca yuktitaḥ*
tapasḥ sutaptaṇ vipulaṇ duṣcaraṇ deva-dānavaiḥ
apūrvāṇ sarvato-bhadraṇ viśvato-mukhaṃ avyayaṃ
abdhair daśāha-saṃyuktaṇ gūḍhaṃ aprājña-ninditaṃ
varṇāśrama-kṛtair dharmair viparītaṃ kvacit samam
gatāntair adhyavasitaṃ atyāśramam idaṇ vrataṃ
mayā paśupataṇ dakṣa yogam utpāditāṇ purā
(MBh. 12. Appendix 1 No. 28.401-407=BORI edition vol. 15, p. 2072-3).

The Pāsupata is enumerated in the list of *moha-śāstra*,
evaṇ saṃbodhito rudro mādhavena murāriṇā
cakāra moha-śāstrāṇi keśavo 'pi śīveritaḥ (112)
kāpālaṇ nākulaṇ vāmaṇ bhairavaṇ pūrva-pāścimam
pañcarātraṇ paśupataṇ tathānyāni sahasraśaḥ (KP 1.15.113)

Cf. also,

nāśayanti hy adhītāni nādhigacchanti cānagha
gāyanti laukikair gānair daivatāni narādhipa (24)
vāma-pāśupatācārās tathā vai pañcarātrikāḥ
bhaviṣyanti kalau tasmin brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyās tathā (KP 1.28.25)
vṛddha-śrāvaka-nirgranthāḥ pañcarātra-vido janāḥ
kāpālikāḥ paśupatāḥ pāṣaṇḍā ye ca tad-vidhāḥ (KP 2.21.34)

of Śaṅkara-bhāṣya, that is, *Ratnaprabhā*, *Bhāmatī* and *Bhāṣya-nyāya-nirṇaya*. We shall below present the texts in due order²³.

(1) *catvāro māheśvarāḥ — śaivāḥ pāśupatāḥ kārūṇika-siddhāntinaḥ kāpālikāś ceti/ sarve 'pi amī maheśvara-proktāgamānugāmitvān māheśvarā ucyante/ kāryaṃ mahad-ādikaṃ, kāraṇaṃ pradhānaṃ īśvaraś ca, yogaḥ samādhiḥ, vidhiḥ triṣaṇa-snānādiḥ, duḥkhānto mokṣa iti pañca padārthāḥ/ paśavo jīvās teṣāṃ pāśo bandhas tan-nāśyetye arthaḥ* (*Ratnaprabhā*)

(2) *māheśvarāś catvāraḥ śaivāḥ pāśupatāḥ kārūṇika-siddhāntinaḥ kāpālikāś ceti/ .../ kāraṇaṃ īśvaraḥ/ kāryaṃ pradhānikaṃ mahad ādi/ yogo 'py oṃkāradī-dhyāna-dhāraṇādiḥ/ vidhiḥ triṣaṇa-snānādir gūḍhacaryāvasānaḥ, duḥkhānto mokṣaḥ/ paśava ātmānas teṣāṃ pāśo bandhanaṃ tad-vimokṣo duḥkhāntaḥ* (*Bhāmatī*)

(3) *catvāro māheśvarāḥ — śaivāḥ pāśupatāḥ kārūṇika-siddhāntinaḥ kāpālikāś ca/ .../ kāryaṃ pradhānikaṃ mahad-ādi, kāraṇaṃ maheśvaraḥ yogaḥ samādhiḥ, vidhiḥ triṣaṇa-snānādiḥ, duḥkhānto mokṣa iti pañca padārthāḥ/ .../ paśavo jīvās teṣāṃ pāśo bandhanaṃ tad-vimokṣo duḥkhāntas...* (*Bhāṣya-nyāya-nirṇaya*)

Four divisions within Śaivism (*māheśvara*), that is, Śaiva, Pāśupata, Kārūṇika-siddhāntin and Kāpālika are here introduced. The same quadruple classification is also met with in the commentaries of Bhāskara, Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, but the order of enumeration is not always the same. We shall discuss this problem later.

In their explanations of the *pañcārtha*, *kāraṇa* comes first in the case of *Bhāmatī*, but the remaining two faithfully follow Śaṅkara's order, enumerating *kārya* first and then *kāraṇa*. Both *Bhāmatī* and *Bhāṣya-nyāya-nirṇaya* rightly gloss *kāraṇa* as the god (*īśvara* or *māheśvara*), but the *Ratnaprabhā* includes therein also *pradhāna*. Here apparently the *Ratnaprabhā* coincides with Yāmuna's *Āgama-prāmāṇya* as we shall see later.

23. Text used here is the same as that quoted in note 21.

As regards the second category, *kārya*, all three are unanimous in explaining it as *mahad-ādi*, but here again *Bhāmatī* and *Bhāṣya-nyāya-nirṇaya* agree with each other in adding the adjective *prādhānika*. Here we note a Sāṃkhyaic flavour (*mahat=buddhi*, *pradhāna=prakṛti*) instead of that of the Pāśupatas who always understand *paśu* (individual soul) under the category of *kārya*.

In the explanation of the category of *yoga*, *Bhāmatī* again deviates from the remaining two, which give only *samādhi*, by adding *oṃkāra*, *dhyāna*, *dhāraṇa* and others. But all three authors seem to have missed the original meaning of the Pāśupata-yoga, which always connotes the “union” of the individual soul with the god, instead of the ordinary yogic practice of contemplation.

Again, in the definition of *vidhi*, *Bhāmatī* holds an unique position compared to the remaining two which only speak of bathing thrice in ashes (*triṣavaṇa-snānādi*) by adding *gūḍha-caryā*, which finds once again an affinity with Bhāskara and Yāmuna as we shall see later.

IV

Next, we shall examine the information given by Bhāskara. But here the text suffers from considerable difficulties²⁴.

tatra māheśvarāś catvāraḥ, pāśupatāḥ śaivāḥ kāpālikāḥ kaṭhaka-siddhāntinaś ceti/ pāśupatīnēśvareṇa praṇītaṇi pañcādhyāyī-śāstraṃ/ pañca ca tatra padārthā vyākhyāyante kāraṇaṃ kāryaṃ yogo vidhir duḥkhānta iti/ kāraṇaṃ īśvaraḥ, kāryaṃ śabda-vācyaṃ pradhānaṃ mahad-ādi ca/ kārya-yogo 'py oṃkāraṃ abhidhāyātkṛd iti kuryāt dhāraṇaṃ ity evaṃ ukto, vidhiḥ padārthaḥ triṣavaṇa-snānādi-gūḍhacaryovasāno, duḥkhānto mokṣa iti/ pāśupata-vaiśeṣika-naiyāyika-kāpālikānām aviśiṣṭāḥ mukty-avasthāyāṃ pāśāṇa-kalpā ātmāno bhavanīti

24. Text used here is ChSS nos.70, 185 and 209, p. 127 (1915).

Here *kāṭhaka-siddhāntin* corresponds to *kāruṇika-siddhāntin* of the three sub-commentaries to *Śaṅkara-bhāṣya* as we have seen above. Moreover, here the order of the enumeration of the four divisions of Śaivism is not the same as we have seen above. For clarity's sake, we shall present below a comparative table of the four divisions as found in the commentaries of BS 2.2.37.

(1) Bhāmatī etc:	Śaiva	Pāsupata	Kāruṇikasiddhāntin	Kāpālika
(2) Bhāskara:	Pāsupata	Śaiva	Kāpālika	Kāthakasiddhāntin
(3) Yāmuna:	Kāpālika	Kālāmukha	Pāsupata	Śaiva
(4) Rāmānuja:	Kāpāla	Kālāmukha	Pāsupata	Śaiva

From the comparative list above, it becomes evident that *Kāruṇika-siddhāntin* of Bhāmatī etc. and *Kāṭhaka-siddhāntin* of Bhāskara correspond to the so-called *Kālāmukha* as found in Yāmuna and Rāmānuja²⁵.

Second, it is remarkable that Bhāskara knew the name of the treatise *Pañcādhyāyī-śāstra*, which is taught (*praṇīta*) by the god himself (*paśupati*) and in which the five categories are explained. The reading *kāryaṃ śabda-vācyam* may be emended to *kārya-śabda-vācyam* and *pradhānaṃ mahad-ādi* is to be read as *prādhānikaṃ mahad-ādi* as is evinced in Bhāmatī.

However, a more important emendation can be suggested of Bhāskara's reading of *yoga*. The emendation is made on the basis of the reading given in the original Pāsupata treatise, that is PS 5. 23-25. As is given above, Bhāskara's text reads as follows,

kārya-yogo 'py oṃkāram abhidhyātkṛd iti kuryād dhāraṇam ity evam ukto...

This reading is to be compared with PS 5.23-25, which read,

ato yogaḥ pravartate (PS 5.23)
oṃkāram abhidhyāyīta (PS 5.24)
hṛdi kurvīta dhāraṇam (PS 5.25)

25. D.N. LORENZEN, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, Two Lost Śaivite Sects* (New Delhi 1972, Second Revised Edition: Delhi, 1991), p. 1.

(Then, yoga is generated [PS 5.23]
 One should meditate on the syllable om [PS 5.24]
 He must hold it in his heart [PS 5.25])

By comparing these two we can reconstruct Bhāskara's text as follows,

*kāryam/ yogo 'py "oṃkāram abhidhyāyīta", "hṛdi kurvīta dhāraṇam"
 ity evam ukto...*

Fourth, the reading of the definition of *vidhi* should be emended into *triṣavaṇa-snānādir gūḍha-caryāvasānaḥ* (starting from "bathing in ashes three times a day and ending in hidden acts.") by comparison with that given in Bhāmatī as we have seen above.

V

Next comes Yāmuna's description given in his *Āgama Prāmāṇya*. The text reads as follows²⁶,

*yathā māheśvare tantre viruddhaṃ bahu-jalpitam
 catur-vidhā hi tat-siddha-caryā-mārgānusāriṇaḥ
 yathā kāpālikāḥ kālāmukhāḥ pāśupatās tathā
 śaivās tatra ca kāpālaṃ matam evaṃ pracakṣate*

Four schools are here mentioned among the Śaivites, that is, Kāpālika, Kālāmukha, Pāśupata and Śaiva, all being condemned by him as heretics (*viruddha*). After introducing the doctrine and practices of the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, he describes the Pāśupatas as follows,

*tatraiṣā pāśupata-prakriyā,
 jīvāḥ paśava ucyante teṣāṃ adhipatiś ca śivaḥ
 sa teṣāṃ upakārāya pañcādhyāyīm acīkṣat*

26. Text used here is J.A.B. VAN BUITENEN, *Yāmuna's Āgama Prāmāṇyam, or Treatise on the Validity of Pañcarātra* (Madras 1971) p. 139.

*tatra pañca padārthās tu vyākhyātāḥ kāraṇādayaḥ
kāraṇaṃ kāryaṃ vidhir yogo duḥkhāntaḥ
upādānaṃ nimittaṃ ca vyākhyātāṃ kāraṇaṃ dvidhā
nimitta-kāraṇaṃ rudras tat-kalā kāraṇāntaram
mahy-antaṃ mahad-ādi kāryam uditaṃ tadvad vidhir gīyate
gūḍhācāra-mukha-śmaśāna-bhasita-snānāvasānaḥ paraḥ
yogo dhāraṇam ucyate hṛdi dhiyām oṃkāra-pūrvaṃ tathā
duḥkhānto hi mato 'pavarga iti te pañcāpi saṃkīrtitāḥ*

As van Buitenen remarked, the text is corrupt and it is not always easy to grasp the exact meaning out of it, but the gist of its contents is as follows.

Cattle (*paśu*) are individual souls and Śiva supervises them. He composed for their benefit (the treatise called) *Pañcādhyāyī*, in which the five categories, *kāraṇa* etc., are elucidated. Of them, *kāraṇa* is of two sorts, the efficient (*nimitta*-) cause is Rudra and the material (*upādāna*-) cause is its ingredients (*kalā*). *Kārya* is the elements, beginning from *mahat* (*buddhi*) and ending at *mahī*. *Vidhi* starts from hidden acts and ends in bathing in ashes gathered from a burning-ground. *Yoga* is called holding (*dhāraṇa*), preceded by (muttering) the syllable *oṃ* in the heart. *Duḥkhānta* is the final emancipation.

As is evident from the above outline, Yāmuna, as is the case with Bhāskara, knew the treatise of *Pañcādhyāyī* and its contents. His two divisions of *kāraṇa* reminds us of *Ratnaprabhā* (*pradhānam īśvaraś ca*) and his equation of *nimitta-kāraṇa* with *īśvara* is identical with Śaṅkara's. Furthermore, the word *kalā* is peculiar to Pāśupata Śaivism.

Also unique is the order of the enumeration of *vidhi-yoga* instead of *yoga-vidhi*. The compounds *gūḍhācāra* and *-snāna* remind us of the wordings of Bhāskara and Bhāmatī, but *-snānāvasāna* is unique, for the texts usually read *-snānādi... gūḍhācārāvasānaḥ*. Here the text is hopelessly corrupt, and van Buitenen proposed to read *gūḍhācāra-bhasma-snāna-śayanādi-kriyā-paraḥ*, though we suspect that such an emendation may have gone too far.

The definition of *yoga* may suggest the original reading of PS 5.23-25, as we have discussed above in the section of Bhāskara. At any rate, both Bhāskara and Yāmuna are faithful to the PS reading,

and here *Bhāmatī* may be included (*omkāradī-dhyāna-dhāraṇādīḥ*). They make a striking contrast to two other sub-commentators to *Śaṅkara-bhāṣya*, who simply equate *yoga* with *samādhi*.

In this connection, it would be convenient to present a comparative table of the order of enumeration of the Pāśupata five categories by these authors.

Śaṅkara:	<i>kārya</i>	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>yoga</i>	<i>vidhi</i>	<i>duḥkhānta</i>
Ratnaprabhā:	<i>kārya</i>	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>yoga</i>	<i>vidhi</i>	<i>duḥkhānta</i>
Bhāmatī:	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>kārya</i>	<i>yoga</i>	<i>vidhi</i>	<i>duḥkhānta</i>
Bhāṣya-N.-N.:	<i>kārya</i>	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>yoga</i>	<i>vidhi</i>	<i>duḥkhānta</i>
Bhāskara:	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>kārya</i>	<i>yoga</i>	<i>vidhi</i>	<i>duḥkhānta</i>
Yāmuna:	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>kārya</i>	<i>vidhi</i>	<i>yoga</i>	<i>duḥkhānta</i>

As far as the order of the first two categories, *kārya* and *kāraṇa*, is concerned, Śaṅkara-Ratnaprabhā-Bhāṣyanyānanirṇaya make one group which puts *kārya* first, while Bhāmatī-Bhāskara-Yāmuna make another group listing *kāraṇa* first. This two-fold division coincides also with the absence and presence of the concept *gūḍha-caryā* (*gūḍhācāra* in Yāmuna) in the explanation of *vidhi*. It is also remarkable that Yāmuna has the reversed order *vidhi-yoga*, instead of the usual *yoga-vidhi*.

VI

Next comes Rāmānuja, who rejects the *paśupati-mata* as *veda-virodha* and *asāmañjasa*, and divides it into four schools in the order of Kāpālas, Kālāmukhas, Pāśupatas and Śaivas, as has been mentioned above. He describes the ritual practices of a tantric nature as ascribed to the first two, that is, Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, but strangely enough, he gives no detailed account of the remaining two, that is, Pāśupata and Śaiva. To our disappointment, little can be gathered from the *Śrībhāṣya*²⁷.

27. Text used here is *Śrībhāṣyam*, vol.III, published by the Academy of Sanskrit Research, Melkote 1990, pp. 160-165.

VII

Lastly, though posterior to Mādhava, we shall examine the Pāśupata doctrine described in the *Prasthāna-bheda* of Madhusūdana-sarasvatī in the 16th century. The text reads as follows²⁸,

tathā paśupati-mataṃ pāśupataṃ śāstraṃ paśupatinā paśu-pāśa-vimokṣaṇāya "athātaḥ pāśupataṃ yoga-vidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ" ity-ādi pañcādhyāyaṃ viracitam/ tatrādhyāya-pañcakenāpi kārya-rūpo jīvaḥ paśuḥ, kāraṇaṃ patiḥ īśvaraḥ, yogo paśupatau citta-samādhānaṃ, vidhir bhasmanā triśavaṇa-snānādir nirūpitaḥ, duḥkḥānta-sañjīṇo mokṣaś ca prayojanam/ eta eva kārya-kāraṇa-yoga-vidhi-duḥkḥānta ity ākhyāyante.

We meet here the first *sūtra* of PS in a somewhat abridged form. The original *sūtra* and that quoted by Mādhava in SDS also differ slightly from each other in minor details. We shall present them below for the purpose of comparison.

athātaḥ paśupateḥ pāśupataṃ yoga-vidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ (PS)

athātaḥ paśupateḥ pāśupata-yoga-vidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ (SDS)

athātaḥ pāśupataṃ yoga-vidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ (*Prasthānabheda*)

Madhusūdanasarasvatī agrees with PS in the reading of *pāśupataṃ yoga-vidhiṃ*, but drops the second word *paśupateḥ* found in PS and SDS. Possibly, he may have quoted it not from PS directly, but from Mādhava. He also names PS as *Pañcādhyāya* or *Adhyāya-pañcaka*. His brief, but lucid, definition of *kārya* (*paśu*) and *kāraṇa* (*pati*) may have been derived from the explanation given in the last portion of PABh. The trinity of Śaivite terms, *paśu*, *pati*, *pāśa*, which we met in Śāṅkara appears here and the compound *paśu-pāśa-vimokṣaṇa* which appears in the *Atharvaśīras Upaniṣad* also occurs here. By and large, his lucid description reminds us of that of Śāṅkara as we have seen in the beginning of this paper, which is always brief and to the point²⁹.

28. Text used here is ASS. 51, p. 11, lines 9-14.

29. L. RENOU, *Histoire de la langue sanskrite* (Paris 1956), p. 139.

Abbreviations used in this article are as follows,

ASS:	<i>Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series</i> (Poona)
ChSS:	<i>Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series</i> (Benares)
EI:	<i>Epigraphia Indica</i> (Calcutta)
GOS:	<i>Gāekwād's Oriental Series</i> (Baroda)
IHQ:	<i>Indian Historical Quarterly</i> (Calcutta)
IJJ:	<i>Indo-Iranian Journal</i> (the Hague and Dordrecht)
KP:	<i>Kūrma-purāṇa</i> (Varanasi Critical Edition 1971)
MBh:	<i>Mahābhārata</i> (Poona Critical Edition)
TSS:	<i>Trivandrum Sanskrit Series</i> (Trivandrum)
WZKS:	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens</i> (Wien)
ZDMG:	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> (Wiesbaden)